
APPENDIX A

EQAC RESOLUTIONS AND POSITIONS JANUARY, 2000 THROUGH OCTOBER, 2001

CONTENTS

<u>Date</u>	<u>Resolution/Position</u>	<u>Page</u>
March 8, 2000	Tree preservation policy (joint resolution with the Tree Commission)	A-2
September 13, 2000	Mapping of streams and watersheds	A-3
October 11, 2000	Out of Turn Plan Amendment regarding stream protection	A-4
October 11, 2000	Infill and Residential Development Study	A-5
November 14, 2000	Virginia's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations	A-6
December, 2000	Endorsement of Tree Commission resolution regarding the addition of tree preservation to the County's 2001 legislative agenda	A-8
April 11, 2001	Proposals for the Route 28 Corridor Improvement Program	A-9
May 9, 2001	Recommendations for modification of Chapter 118 of the Fairfax County Code (Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance)	A-11
May 9, 2001	Interim stream protection	A-13
June 19, 2001	Staff responses to recommendations in EQAC's 2000 <i>Annual Report on the Environment</i>	A-14
July 11, 2001	Stormwater and BMP waivers	A-15
July 11, 2001	Proposed permit reapplication for Fairfax County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)	A-18
July 11, 2001	Proposed closure of the compressed natural gas refueling site	A-19
July 27, 2001	Support for recent land acquisitions by the Board of Supervisors	A-20

JOINT RESOLUTION

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL TREE COMMISSION

March 8, 2000

Whereas the Tree Preservation Task Force representing a broad cross-section of the citizens of Fairfax County has conducted a comprehensive study of past, present and future tree cover and tree preservation requirements for Fairfax County; and

Whereas the work of the Tree Preservation Task Force has resulted in excellent recommendations for increasing tree cover and preserving trees so as to improve the quality of life for the citizens of Fairfax County, and provide habitat for wildlife; and

Whereas those recommendations have been presented to and approved by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors; and

Whereas it is now desirable to establish mechanisms to implement these approved recommendations and create policy guidance that will insure accomplishment of the Tree Preservation Task Force recommendations;

Now therefore be it resolved that it is the joint recommendation of the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council and the Fairfax County Tree Commission that language consistent with the recommendations of the Tree Preservation Task Force be incorporated into the Fairfax County Policy Plan.

It is further resolved that a workgroup comprised of members from the Tree Preservation Task Force, the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council, and the Fairfax County Tree Commission be created to draft specific language for inclusion in the County Policy Plan and to work with appropriate County Boards, Commissions, and Agencies towards this end.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION ON

MAPPING OF STREAMS AND WATERSHEDS

September 13, 2000

WHEREAS, the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Corridor Policy establishes stream valleys as the core of the EQC system;

WHEREAS, perennial streams and watersheds in the County that collect drainage from 360 or more acres of land are key components of Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) as defined by the County's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 118 of the *Fairfax County Code*) and are afforded protection in accordance with this ordinance;

WHEREAS, the elements and features comprising EQCs and RPAs are clearly delineated in the *Fairfax County Policy Plan* with specific reference to both the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and the EQC Policy;

WHEREAS, the boundaries and areas of watersheds are readily and accurately determinable from the County's existing topographic maps, but the mapping of perennial streams is taken from U. S. Geological Survey 7 1/2 minute quadrangle maps which are known to contain significant errors in the depiction of the course, and particularly the extent, of the perennial portions of the upper ends of the County's watercourses;

WHEREAS, the County Staff routinely applies the Policy Plan provisions during the development review process in order to obtain from applicants commitments for protection of EQCs and RPAs, but the protections achieved can be no better than the often flawed mapping data upon which they are predicated; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Environmental Quality Advisory Council urgently requests the Board of Supervisors to direct County Staff to undertake determination and re-mapping of the County's stream valleys and watercourses in order to accurately reflect the true course and extent of all perennial portions thereof;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that EQAC requests that Chapter 118 of the *Fairfax County Code* be amended to provide more precise definitions of RPAs based on the re-mapping recommended above and the regulations and requirements applying thereto.

**EQAC Comments re: Out of Turn Plan Amendment S00-CW-2CP
October 11, 2000**

As mentioned in the Staff Report for Out-Of-Turn Plan Amendment S00-CW-2CP, in June, 1998, members of EQAC and the Planning Commission's Environment Committee began talks on the County's Policy Plan as it relates to stream protection issues. EQAC felt that, while the Policy Plan addressed some stream valley issues, there wasn't an overarching statement on what we wanted the conditions of our streams to be.

The proposed amendment addresses that concern and provides clear policy direction for the County's stream valleys. EQAC therefore recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed Out-Of-Turn Plan Amendment S00-CW-2CP as presented within the Staff Report dated August 21, 2000, with some changes as noted below.

EQAC suggests three minor changes to the Staff proposal:

1. Add the following sentence to Objective 2, Policy d on page 10 of 12 of the staff report:

"To the extent possible, ponds constructed in an EQC shall be designed to protect and restore the ecological integrity of the EQC."

EQAC feels that this sentence is needed to address the limited times when ponds are constructed in EQCs, pointing out that steps need to be taken in the overall spirit of Objective 2 which is "Protect and restore the ecological integrity of streams in Fairfax County".

2. Add a new bullet to Objective 2, Policy k on page 11 of 12, following the bullets that address the preservation of wooded areas and the encouragement to fulfill tree cover requirements. This should contain words such as:

"Where appropriate, use conservation easements as a means toward the preservation of wooded areas and steep slopes and the fulfillment of tree cover requirement through tree preservation."

At present, the best way to ensure these goals is for the County to purchase portions of the property to be protected or to have the land dedicated to the County or the Park Authority when the land is being rezoned. Often, neither of these options is feasible. EQAC's proposed language adds another viable option to these two choices.

3. Add to the last paragraph of Objective 9 (on page A-2 of the Staff Report) as follows (the underlined sentence is the addition):

"Preservation should be achieved through dedication to the Fairfax County Park Authority, if such dedication is in the public interest. Otherwise, EQC land should remain in private ownership in separate undeveloped lots with appropriate commitments for preservation. Where possible, these commitments for preservation should be guaranteed through conservation easements."

Again, this proposed language adds a viable option aimed at strengthening the commitments for preservation.

EQAC voted at its 11 October 2000 meeting to send these comments to the Board of Supervisors.

(Position adopted October 11, 2000 and reiterated January 10, 2001)

EQAC Comments to the Planning Commission
on the
Infill & Residential Development Study
Dated July 26, 2000

Generally, EQAC supports the recommendations in the *Infill & Residential Development Study*, Draft Staff Recommendations Report, dated July 26, 2000 as they apply to environmental protection in the county. In particular:

- Recommendation TR 4, which would increase opportunities to utilize public transportation and increase pedestrian access to retail and community facilities, potentially could lead to reduced automotive use, thereby reducing nonpoint air emissions and improving air quality.
- Recommendations TP 1 through 4 seek to improve tree preservation in the county, particularly during new construction. EQAC has long supported this goal in the county, and we concur with these recommendations.
- Recommendations SW 1 through 13 seek to improve stormwater management in the county. EQAC is concerned that adequate stormwater management is not in place. Moreover, enforcement has been lacking in recent years, leading to cases of damage due to runoff from land disturbing projects. EQAC generally supports the improvements outlined in the document.

However, we are concerned that the recommendations do not go far enough. EQAC remains concerned that little or no attention is given to the cumulative impacts of stormwater runoff within the County, and the recommendations of the Infill Study do not address this critical concern. Fairfax County streams and watersheds continue to be impacted by the failure of comprehensive land use planning and site design that adequately incorporate watershed and stream protection requirements into their plans and fail to consider the cumulative effects of land use decisions. Stormwater runoff and erosion continue to be the largest problems within Fairfax county streams. Most Fairfax County streams have increased stormwater runoff flows that exceed the capacity of the stream. This results in erosion problems throughout the County and contributes to sediment deposition in ponds (both large and small) that requires frequent maintenance and dredging.

In our *Annual Report on the Environment*, 1999, EQAC strongly recommended that a Comprehensive Countywide Stream Management Program be implemented. As part of this Program, we recommended that all water quality monitoring reports and ongoing assessments of existing watershed include point and non-point sources as well as amounts of impervious surface and vegetative cover. We also called for an updated integrated regional stormwater management utility that could give careful examination to each site. Finally, we called for funding of the Stormwater Utility Program as a means to ensure environmental protection, restoration, and monitoring as compared to infrastructure improvement and maintenance.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

November 14, 2000

Board of Supervisors
County of Fairfax
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, VA 22035

Dear Madam Chairman and Members of the Board:

We at EQAC applaud the unanimous decision of the Board of Supervisors on Monday, October 30 to approve the out-of-turn Policy Plan Amendment to add language to the Policy Plan that would protect streams and improve water quality. We would ask that you extend that same concern for our local streams and local water quality to supporting and strengthening the provisions of Virginia's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations. The Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board and Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department are considering modifications to these Regulations, and we understand that the Board of Supervisors will be considering this matter at its November 20 meeting.

We view the most significant part of the Regulations as those that govern the description and definition of the Resource Protection Area (RPA) buffers. These buffers have been defined as areas "not less than 100 feet in width located adjacent to and landward of" tidal wetlands; nontidal wetlands connected by surface flow and contiguous to tidal wetlands or tributary streams; and tidal shores. In addition, 100 foot wide buffer areas are required along both sides of any tributary stream. These buffers provide the single largest water quality benefit when implemented properly and in their entirety. This County recognized that benefit many years prior to the enactment of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act with the development and implementation of the Environmental Quality Corridor (EQC) policy in stream valleys throughout Fairfax County. We therefore urge the Board of Supervisors to support the continued implementation of the 100 foot buffer requirement and to disallow all intrusions into the buffer. To that end we ask that the Board ask the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department to:

- 1) Reject the proposed permitting of sub-division scale and regional scale flood control and stormwater management facilities within the RPA;
- 2) Severely limit or restrict the removal of "dead or diseased trees or shrubs" and "noxious weeds" from the buffer area, and any other activities that reduce the amount of vegetation already in the designated buffer areas. Should there be removal of vegetation, require replacement by vegetation with plants equal in function; and
- 3) Severely limit or restrict the removal of vegetation for "scenic vistas". Also require replacement of removed vegetation with plants equal in function if such removal occurs.

Designation of Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) is dependent upon a clear and precise delineation of perennial streams within the County. EQAC has already contacted the Board regarding the map flaws in the United States Geological Survey Maps, which are used for perennial stream designations. On October 16, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a motion to refer this matter to the staff for resolution. We ask also that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors support language within the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations that calls for an accurate and real designation of perennial streams throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

We look forward to working with the Board of Supervisors in Fairfax County efforts to steward the streams and waters of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert D. McLaren". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Robert" and last name "McLaren" being clearly distinguishable.

Robert D. McLaren, Chairman
Environmental Quality Advisory Council

Resolution
Of the
Fairfax County Tree Commission

December 6, 2000

**(ENDORSED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL,
DECEMBER, 2000)**

Whereas the lack of state enabling legislation is a barrier to effective tree preservation in Fairfax County;

Therefore, now be it resolved, that the Fairfax County Tree Commission recommends that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors add to the 2001 legislative agenda, for the meeting of the Virginia General Assembly, tree preservation as a priority for future land development within Fairfax County.

FAIRFAX COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

April 11, 2001

Dear Supervisor McConnell:

Per your request, EQAC reviewed the two proposals for the Rt.28 Corridor Improvement Program. The first proposal is by the Route 28 Corridor Improvements, LLC (Clark Construction Group and Shirley Contracting Corporation) while the second proposal is by Fluor Daniel and Morrison Knudsen LLC (FD/MK).

We looked at these proposals in terms of runoff, land impact, and wetlands. The amount of information on environmental impact in these proposals is limited, with the Clark-Shirley proposal containing the least amount of information. Given that caveat, we believe that the FD/MK proposal is superior for a number of reasons.

In the first area, storm water runoff, both proposals will comply with the Virginia Stormwater Management (SWM) Handbook (1999). Both proposals recognize the requirement for Best Management Practices. Neither proposal gives consideration to innovative stormwater management concepts. In fact, the Clark-Shirley proposal appears to rule out bioengineering approaches. EQAC would like to see consideration given to these innovative approaches. Quite often the innovative approaches are more environmentally friendly than the standard SWM designs. In this area, neither proposal appears to shine.

In the second area, land impact, the FD/MK proposal appears superior. The FD/MK proposal is far more detailed. This level of detail addresses the interchanges and gives better information about what will actually be required to complete the project. The amount of land required appears to be less than that under the Clark-Shirley proposal.

The reduced land required for the FD/MK plan directly impacts the third area – wetlands. Here the FD/MK plan is superior, with the Clark-Shirley plan apparently taking 12.14 acres and the FD/MK plan taking 10.49 acres – a reduction of 14 percent. Furthermore, the FD/MK proposal is stronger in that it recognizes the necessity to conduct joint field delineations and surveys. Additionally, the FD/MK proposal calls for the establishment of a Technical Advisory Group. Based on the proposed membership of this group, environmental issues such as wetlands would be addressed in the advisory group.

The main difference in the proposals is the FD/MK focus on HOT lanes. Clark-Shirley touts the simplicity in avoiding toll collection. This approach seems to be the opposite direction taken by heavily populated areas in the Northeastern US. Construction of a large freeway is sure to attract large volumes of interstate traffic, including heavy trucks, which degrade air quality and contribute to gridlock. The FD/MK proposal for smart tag/tolls provides a method to pay for the highway in the short term and avoid additional expansion in the long term. Not to mention the reduction in cost to the residents who live

Supervisor Elaine McConnell
Page Two

in the area of the highway. There is also an ability to increase tolls as congestion or need to control traffic in the HOT lanes arises.

In conclusion, EQAC would like to see increased attention given to innovative practices for SWM, increased emphasis on reducing the limits of clearing and grading, and careful attention to further reducing wetland impacts.

Sincerely,

(signed by Chairman)

Robert McLaren

**FAIRFAX COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
MODIFICATION OF CHAPTER 118 OF THE
FAIRFAX COUNTY ORDINANCES**

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors accepted the finding of the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) that the present designations of perennial tributary streams qualifying as Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) are seriously flawed;

WHEREAS, These deficiencies result from the use of U. S. Geological Survey 7 1/2 minute quadrangle maps as the sole source for identifying the perennial portions of tributary streams;

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the EQAC recommendation, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare a plan for remapping the streams of Fairfax County;

WHEREAS, The plan submitted by staff on May 7, 2001, indicates a 36 month time frame for completion of the effort and outlines two approaches: 1) complete the remapping and present the finished product to the Board for approval at the end of 36 months or 2) submit the results for each stream valley for approval as it is completed;

WHEREAS, Certain minimal revisions to Chapter 118 (Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance) of the Fairfax County Code are required in order to implement either of the above approaches; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Environmental Quality Advisory Council strongly advocates and supports the second (or incremental) approach outlined in the plan prepared by staff, since it places RPA protection on streams in the most timely manner; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Environmental Quality Advisory recommends modification of two provisions of Chapter 118 of the Code as detailed in the attachment to this resolution.

**MODIFICATIONS TO FAIRFAX COUNTY ORDINANCES
REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE INCREMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE
FAIRFAX COUNTY STREAM REMAPPING PROJECT
AND THE
STREAM PROTECTION STRATEGY**

In the two modifications recommended below, deleted text in the current ordinance is shown in ~~strikeout type~~ and added text is shown in **boldface type**.

CHAPTER 118. Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance

Section 118-1-6. Definitions

(o) *Major floodplain* means those land areas in and adjacent to streams and watercourses subject to continuous or periodic inundation from flood events with a one percent (1%) chance of occurrence in any given year (i.e., the 100-year flood frequency event) and having a drainage area equal to or greater than ~~three hundred sixty (360) acres~~ **fifty (50) acres**.

(cc) *Tributary stream* means ~~any perennial stream~~ **the perennial portion of any watercourse** that is so depicted on **any of the following**:

- 1) The most recent U. S. Geological Survey 7 1/2 minute topographic quadrangle map (scale 1:24,000); **or**
- 2) **Any relevant overlay map (verified for accuracy) in the Fairfax County Geographic Information System (GIS); or**
- 3) **A stream valley map that is part of the Fairfax County Stream Protection Study; or**
- 4) **A specially prepared map, in a form approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, certified as to accuracy by a technically competent organization, such as Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District, Audubon Naturalist Society, a University or Research Institution;**

whichever of the above shall be most inclusive of the watercourse and all of its perennial branches. The presence of the botanical genus *Fontinalis*, or such other indicator species as shall from time to time be designated, shall be prima facie evidence of perenniality.

**FAIRFAX COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION REGARDING
INTERIM STREAM PROTECTION**

WHEREAS, Fairfax County is required to comply with state and regional compact regulations regarding protection of the Chesapeake Bay and waters tributary thereto, including the establishment of Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) for one hundred feet on each side of any perennial tributary stream;

WHEREAS, All Fairfax County streams ultimately reach the Potomac River and, therefore, under the Chesapeake Bay regulations are, de facto, tributary streams, although parts of many of them are not so characterized due to defective definitions in applicable ordinances;

WHEREAS, The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, in January 2001, accepted and endorsed a staff study titled the Fairfax County Stream Protection Strategy which documented requirements for stream protection;

WHEREAS, The Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council, in October 2000, by resolution to the Board of Supervisors, noted the serious inaccuracies in the U. S. Geological Survey 7 1/2 minute quadrangle maps currently used for determining perennial tributary stream and recommended remapping of Fairfax County stream valleys to accurately determine the source and location of perennial flow in Fairfax county watercourses;

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors directed staff to develop a plan for accomplishing such remapping and staff on May 7, 2001, delivered to the Board an updated version of this plan which would require 36 months for completion;

WHEREAS, A number of park and school development projects have been proposed on tracts of land that contain streams that are not now correctly mapped as perennial tributary streams but that would be designated as Resource Protection Areas upon correction of the present defective mapping; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Environmental Quality Advisory Council requests the Board of Supervisors, the Park Authority, the School Board, and the Planning Commission of Fairfax County to approve or adopt no plan (including park or school master plans), or modification of any existing plan, for any lands under their ownership or control that allows or contemplates any land disturbing activity within one hundred feet of any stream on such land until its proper status is determined by the stream remapping study.

FAIRFAX COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

June 19, 2001

Board of Supervisors
County of Fairfax
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, VA 22035

Dear Madam Chairman and Members of the Board:

After EQAC presented its 2000 Annual Report on the Environment (ARE) to the Board of Supervisors, the Board directed Fairfax County Staff to respond to EQAC's recommendations. EQAC is now reviewing Staff's responses and will incorporate our comments on these responses in the Scorecard in our 2001 Annual Report.

EQAC, however, would like to pass on to the Board of Supervisors our overall impression of the Staff responses. We find that the Staff responses are very well thought out. It is evident that the Staff carefully evaluated EQAC's recommendations. Where Staff differed with EQAC's recommended approach, they considered alternative approaches to achieve the same goal. Furthermore, the Staff responses went into significant detail on how to implement EQAC's recommendations. The responses were also coordinated between the appropriate Staff agencies rather than each agency replying on its own.

The Environmental Coordinating Committee coordinated the Staff responses. This is a first for the group and the product was far superior to past Staff responses. Please pass on to all Fairfax County Staff members involved in preparing responses to EQAC's 2000 ARE our thanks for a very thorough and thoughtful set of responses.

Sincerely,

(signed by Chairman)

Robert D. McLaren, Chairman
Environmental Quality Advisory Council

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION REGARDING STORMWATER AND BMP WAIVERS

July 11, 2001

WHEREAS, Fairfax County has enacted ordinances and administrative regulations that require post-development stormwater runoff from sites of proposed development be no greater than pre-development runoff and that such water discharged from the site meet certain standards imposed by the Chesapeake Bay compacts; and

WHEREAS, In calendar year 2000, roughly thirty six (36) percent of site and subdivision plans reviewed by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) requested and were granted waivers from such stormwater detention requirements and some forty-five (45) percent of plans reviewed requested and were granted waivers of water quality (BMP) requirements; and

WHEREAS, For a six month period in 1999, only approximately four (4) percent of requested stormwater detention waivers and three (3) percent of requested water quality waivers were denied; and

WHEREAS, For that same period, approximately twenty-nine (29) percent of detention requests and fifteen (15) percent of water quality waiver requests were granted on the grounds that off-site detention or BMP controls were provided, but often the assertions that such controls were in place and of adequate capacity were not adequately documented by the applicant or field-verified by County staff; and

WHEREAS, For that same period, approximately thirty-five (35) percent of detention waiver requests were granted based on the applicant's assertion that there would be no increase in runoff, but the validity of such assertions is extremely improbable and analysis suggests that most are based on very different sets of assumptions that maximize calculated pre-development runoff and minimize calculated post-development runoff; and

WHEREAS, For that same period, approximately four (4) percent of detention waivers were granted based on the applicant's assertion that drainage from the site would discharge into a major floodplain, but it is suggested that such assertions are rarely supported by an "adequate outfall" analysis; and

WHEREAS, For that same period, approximately fifteen (15) percent of detention waivers and four (4) percent of water quality waivers were granted on the grounds that they discharge into a watercourse or area for which a regional stormwater management facility is proposed, but it is well known and understood that many of these planned facilities will never be built and even if constructed will be years away; and

WHEREAS, Under current “adequate outfall” requirements, a design engineer must demonstrate only that the discharge of a site into a man-made system (e.g., a piped storm sewer) will not exceed the capacity of such system in a ten-year storm, and that discharge into an erodible channel (i.e., a grass lined swale or an existing watercourse) must be sufficient for a two-year storm (e.g., without overtopping the banks and/or eroding the channel); and

WHEREAS, DPWES reviewers possess varying degrees of expertise on stormwater management and BMP issues, which leads to inconsistent decisions in determining the adequacy of stormwater management designs; and

WHEREAS, Only upon receiving complaints do DPWES reviewers make visits to the sites for which waivers are requested in order to determine the accuracy and adequacy of the design engineer’s assumptions, calculations and narrative; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Environmental Quality Advisory Council requests the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive to direct the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services as follows:

1. Subject requests for waiver of stormwater detention and/or water quality requirements to a higher standard of scrutiny and proof before granting.
2. Critically evaluate assertions that off-site controls are in place and analyze their adequacy to meet the increased loads imposed by the applicant’s site.
3. Critically review applications for waivers based on the contention that there will be no increase in runoff, which is highly improbable, exercising due care to see that there are not gross discrepancies between pre-development and post-development assumptions and methods of calculation.
4. No longer grant waivers permitting discharge of water from a site into a major floodplain unless extensive and appropriate ‘adequate outfall’ measures are made part of the site plan.
5. Since “future ponds” provide no current protection and, in fact, may never be constructed, grant no further waivers of either stormwater detention or water quality requirements on these grounds.
6. Require that all “adequate outfall” calculations and analyses be based on a range of storms, beginning with the smallest storm that causes incipient erosion up to a ten-year event, regardless of the type of system to which the water from the site is delivered.
7. Provide training to DPWES reviewers so as to raise the overall level of expertise.

8. Require an on-site evaluation by the DPWES reviewer where any part of the applicant's request for waiver is open to question on the grounds of input assumptions, analytical calculation, or narrative justification.

**FAIRFAX COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION REGARDING PROPOSED PERMIT
REAPPLICATION FOR FAIRFAX COUNTY'S MUNICIPAL
SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4)**

July 11, 2001

On July 11, 2001, the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) adopted the following resolution regarding the proposed submission of a permit reapplication for Fairfax County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4):

EQAC supports the MS4 Plan as presented.

This resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of all members present.

**FAIRFAX COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
RESOLUTION REGARDING PROPOSED CLOSURE OF
THE COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS REFUELING SITE**

July 11, 2001

On July 11, 2001, the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) adopted the following resolution regarding the proposed closure of the compressed natural gas (CNG) refueling site at the West Ox Maintenance Facility:

- EQAC recommends that the CNG facility be removed as soon as possible;
- EQAC recommends that the County move to purchase Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) fuel for its diesel fuel vehicle fleet;
- EQAC recommends that the implementation of conversion to ULSD fuel be accelerated from the schedule mandated by the Clean Air Act;
- EQAC recommends that, as the County purchases new diesel engine vehicles, the new vehicles incorporate those engines that can best use ULSD to reduce emissions into the atmosphere; and
- EQAC recommends that the County continue to investigate and track alternate fuels and, if and when their successful application would appear to be feasible, consider the use of such fuels.

This resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of all members present.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

July 27, 2001

Board of Supervisors
County of Fairfax
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, VA 22035

Dear Madam Chairman and Members of the Board:

At the July 11, 2001 meeting of the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC), the Council discussed recent land acquisitions by the Board of Supervisors and the criticisms that these land acquisitions have elicited. EQAC supports the efforts that the Board has taken over the past year to acquire and protect open space, and we encourage the Board to continue to take advantage of opportunities to acquire park land as these opportunities present themselves. Much of the land that the Board has acquired has significant environmental value, and it is the view of EQAC that the acquisition of this land reflects considerable foresight on the part of the Board. By a unanimous vote of the members present at the July 11 meeting, EQAC asked me to convey its support for your recent actions.

Sincerely,

(signed by Chairman)

Robert D. McLaren, Chairman
Environmental Quality Advisory Council

cc: EQAC File, July, 2001